Notice of Intent To Rule on Application To Impose and Use the Revenue From a Passenger Facility Charge (PFC) at Robert Mueller Airport, Austin, TX

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of intent to rule on application.

SUMMARY: The FAA proposes to rule and invites public comment on the application to impose and use the revenue from a PFC at Robert Mueller Municipal Airport under the provisions of the Aviation Safety and Capacity Expansion Act of 1990 (Title IX of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990) (Public Law 101–508) and part 158 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR part 158).

DATES: Comments must be received on or before March 6, 1995.

ADDRESSES: Comments on this application may be mailed or delivered in triplicate copies to the FAA at the following address: Mr. Ben Guttery, Federal Aviation Administration, Southwest Region, Airports Division, Planning and Programming Staff, ASW–610D, Fort Worth, TX 76193–0610.

In addition, one copy of any comments submitted to the FAA must be mailed or delivered to Mr. Charles W. Gates, Director of Aviation, at the following address: Mr. Charles W. Gates, Director of Aviation, City of Austin, 3600 Manor Road, Austin, TX 78723.

Air carriers and foreign air carriers may submit copies of the written comments previously provided to the Airport under section 158.23 of part 158.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Ben Guttery, Federal Aviation Administration, Southwest Region, Airports Division, Planning and Programming Staff, ASW–610D, Fort Worth, TX 76193–0610, (817) 222–5614.

The application may be reviewed in person at this same location.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The FAA proposes to rule and invites public comment on the application to impose and use the revenue from a PFC at Robert Mueller Municipal Airport under the provisions of the Aviation Safety and Capacity Expansion Act of 1990 (Title IX of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990) (Public Law 101–508) and part 158 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR part 158).

On December 22, 1994, the FAA determined that the application to impose and use the revenue from a PFC submitted by the airport was substantially complete within the requirements of section 158.25 of part 158. The FAA will approve or disapprove the application, in whole or in part, no later than April 20, 1995.

The following is a brief overview of the application.

Level of the proposed PFC: $3.00
Proposed charge effective date: March 1, 1995
Proposed charge expiration date: May 31, 2021
Total estimated PFC revenue: $337,821,000.00

Brief Description of Proposed Project(s)

Projects To Impose and Use PFC's

New Airport Passenger Terminal Complex; New Airport Airfield Facilities; and New Airport Landside Facilities.

Proposed class or classes of air carriers to be exempted from collecting PFC's:

On-demand air taxi/commercial operators that (1) do not enplane or deplane at the airport's main passenger building, and (2) enplane fewer than 500 passengers per year at the airport.

Any person may inspect the application in person at the FAA office listed above under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** and at the FAA regional airports office located at: Federal Aviation Administration, Southwest Region, Airports Division, Planning and Programming Staff, ASW–610D, 2601 Meacham Boulevard, Fort Worth, TX 76137–4298.

In addition, any person may, upon request, inspect the application, notice, and other documents germane to the application in person at the airport.

Issued in Fort Worth, Texas on December 22, 1994.

John M. Dempsey,

Manager, Airports Division.

[FR Doc. 95–2566 Filed 2–1–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–M

Federal Highway Administration

[FHWA Docket No. 95–5]

Comprehensive Truck Size and Weight Study

AGENCY: Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), DOT.

ACTION: Request for comments and establishment of docket.

SUMMARY: This notice requests public comment on an FHWA Comprehensive Truck Size and Weight Study (CTS&WS) through an open docket. In addition, the notice articulates the FHWA's goals with regard to studying the many issues related to truck size and weight (TS&W) policy. Public comments are solicited at this time on the study plan described below and responses are sought to a set of policy questions listed below. FHWA working papers developed for Phase I of the study will be placed in the docket for review and comment by February 15, 1995.

DATES: This docket will remain open until the study is completed. However, in order for comments to be considered during the critical early stages of the study, they should be received no later than April 3, 1995.

ADDRESSES: Submit written, signed comments to FHWA Docket No. 95–5, Federal Highway Administration, Room 4232, HCC–10, Office of the Chief Counsel, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC 20590. Interested parties are requested to identify themselves for inclusion on a mailing list for notification of any public meeting(s) that may be held in connection with this study and availability of interim products by providing their names and mailing addresses to the above docket. All public meetings will also be announced in the **Federal Register**.

All comments received will be available for examination at the above address between 8:30 a.m. and 3:30 p.m., e.t., Monday through Friday, except legal holidays. Those desiring notification of receipt of comments must include a self-addressed, stamped envelope or postcard.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Philip Blow, Office of Policy Development, at (202) 366–4036; Mr. Thomas Klimek, Office of Motor Carrier Information Management and Analysis, at (202) 366–2212, or Mr. Charles Medalen, Office of Chief Counsel, at (202) 366–1354, Federal Highway Administration, Department of Transportation, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC 20590. Office hours are from 7:45 a.m. to 4:15 p.m., e.t., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

This study is being conducted partly in response to a legislative proposal in the 103rd Congress, H.R. 4496, that would: (1) Freeze the weights allowed by State law or permit regulation on the non-Interstate portion of the National Highway System (NHS), and (2) freeze the length of new trailers at 53 feet. This bill, or similar legislation, could have a significant impact on the public and private sectors and on the safety and efficiency of the total transport system.

The current TS&W regulations were based on concerns for national

uniformity and good highway system stewardship, including matching vehicle weights and dimensions with the existing public infrastructure and with mechanisms for cost recovery. At times, some States have adopted new pavement and bridge design standards to better match the weights and dimensions of the vehicles being allowed to operate on their highways. Highway engineers are concerned about premature degradation of that infrastructure and the consequent strain on public resources. As technology and shipper demand have resulted in larger and heavier trucks, concerns for highway safety (adequate brakes and vehicle handling and stability) and loss of rail service (due to loss of freight traffic to larger trucks) have become increasingly important, especially with regard to longer combination vehicles (LCV). LCVs are multi-cargo unit truck combinations that weigh more than 80,000 pounds. Typical LCVs are Rocky Mountain doubles (combinations with one trailer 40 feet or longer and another 30 feet or shorter), turnpike doubles (combinations with two 40-foot or longer trailers), or triples (combinations with all three trailers 30 feet or shorter in length).

A shift of some TS&W regulatory responsibilities from the States to the Federal Government occurred at the start of the Interstate construction era in the 1950s, and since then, the distribution of this shared responsibility has shifted back and forth. Now as the Interstate construction era draws to a close, the transport community is again reassessing the Federal role in the context of future highway transportation needs.

The ultimate goal of a comprehensive TS&W study effort is to estimate the net effects of various regulatory options on a transport system evolving to serve a modern global economy. New vehicles, electronic technology, and distribution systems create new capabilities and opportunities. The effects of changing logistics costs, production strategies, and shipping patterns must be evaluated from the perspectives of carriers, managers of infrastructure, shippers, consumers, and the traveling public. Further, the safety and environmental impacts of these regulatory policies must be fully considered.

Thus, TS&W policy touches upon a variety of public concerns such as safety, infrastructure design and wear, carrier and shipper productivity, States' rights and national uniformity, environment, energy use, intermodal competition, and cost recovery. In addition, these concerns exist at the local, State, regional, national, and international scales. The CTS&WS will summarize a wide array of information on the many related aspects of TS&W policy.

Study Plan

In order to address the issues related to possible changes in Federal TS&W provisions, the following study plan has been developed. *Phase I,* TS&W Synthesis, will assess past policy studies and research findings. The major purpose of this phase is to describe what is known about the technical relationships between TS&W policy controls and their related issues. TS&W studies completed within the last 15 years, as well as more recent research not covered in these studies, are being synthesized. The history of State and Federal TS&W regulation is also being reviewed. In addition, State and Federal TS&W regulations are being summarized, and knowledge and research gaps on TS&W issues are being identified and prioritized.

The available material is being synthesized under the subject areas: vehicle stability and control, truck accident data, pavement and bridge wear, highway geometry, traffic operations, truck operating costs, shipper logistics costs, truck travel, mode share, enforcement, environment, energy conservation, permits and pricing mechanisms. Working Papers will be available to the public by February 15, 1995. Phase I will be completed in early 1995.

Phase II, a Preliminary Option Analysis, will evaluate on a limited basis specific policy options using existing databases. This analysis will be preliminary because new data for a comprehensive analysis of TS&W issues, such as commodity flow information, is not expected to be made available by the Bureau of the Census until late 1995. Therefore, Phase II policy options will include appropriate caveats regarding the limitations of earlier studies. The analysis will be as comprehensive as possible, at a minimum including the impacts of changes in Federal TS&W provisions on safety, infrastructure and economic productivity. This phase will be completed during the summer of 1995.

Phase III, an Extended Impact Analysis, will be able to use the data and new tools that become available in 1995 and 1996 to prepare in-depth analyses of the Phase II policy options. It will incorporate results from a parallel cost allocation study, which the FHWA is undertaking to determine whether the various highway users, including heavy vehicles, are paying their fair share into the Highway Trust Fund. Specific policy options will be analyzed using improved information on freight flows and truck use. Phase III will address the full range of costs and benefits estimated to derive from these options. This last phase of the study will be completed by the end of 1996.

Policy Questions and Comments

In addition to comments on the study plan described above, responses to the following questions are solicited from any parties interested in TS&W regulations and issues. The following key policy questions will be considered during the course of the three-phase study:

Federal Interests and Role

1. What are the Federal interests in TS&W regulation? What are the State and local government interests? How can conflicts among Federal, State, and local interests be accommodated?

2. Should there be a Federal role in areas such as standards, investment decisions, user fee collection, operational controls, and enforcement? What should that role be?

3. To what extent is national uniformity needed? For which type of motor carrier operations is national uniformity in TS&W regulation desirable? In terms of type and area of motor carrier operations, in which cases would regional uniformity be more appropriate? For which type of highways is national uniformity desirable? In which cases would regional uniformity be appropriate?

Weight Limits

4. Are changes in Federal weight limits desirable? If so, how should the present Federal vehicle weight limits be changed? (These limits include the single and tandem-axle weight limits, the 80,000-pound gross vehicle weight limit, and the Federal bridge formula. The Federal bridge formula is:

$$W=500\{[LN/(n-1)]+12N+36\}$$

where: W = the maximum weight in pounds that can be carried on a group of two or more axles to the nearest 500 pounds. L = the spacing in feet between the outer axles of any two or more axles. N = the number of axles being considered.

Why are the changes needed? Which shippers or producers would benefit from these changes, and to what extent do they benefit? How would the public benefit from these changes?

5. Should there be a specific Federal weight limit for tridem axles, as there are for single and tandem axles? (The allowable load on a tridem is now determined by Bridge Formula B and varies from 42,000, if the axles are

spread just over 8 feet, to 43,500 pounds, if the spread is 10 feet.)

6. Is there a need for Federal regulation of tire loads and pressures or other tire controls for the purpose of protecting highway pavements? How should they be specified?

7. If Federal vehicle weight limits were increased, should additional requirements be placed on the heavier vehicles and their operation? For which vehicles should such requirements be considered? Why are these requirements needed?

Size Limits

8. Should the present Federal vehicle size (length and width) limits be changed? If so, how should they be changed? Why are these changes needed? Which shippers or producers would benefit from these changes, and to what extent would they benefit? How would the public benefit from these changes?

9. If Federal vehicle size limits were increased, should additional requirements be placed on the larger vehicles and their operations? For which vehicles should such requirements be considered? Why are these requirements needed?

10. Presently, there are no Federal regulations governing truck height. Is there a need for a Federal vehicle height limit? If so, why is it needed?

Performance Standards

11. Could performance standards, such as ability to maintain a minimum speed, be used as a part of a new Federal TS&W policy? How would such standards achieve results at least equivalent to current size and weight limits and vehicle requirements? How could these standards be applied and enforced?

Grandfather Rights

12. Should State authority to claim grandfather rights under Federal TS&W provisions (including overweight permit authority) be left intact, frozen, or phased out? Why?

Permits

13. How does the extent of motor carrier operations under overweight permits compare to that for operations that do not require permits? What portion of the nondivisible load permits are issued routinely; that is, without an engineering review? Nonroutinely, with an engineering review? What portion of overweight permits are issued for divisible loads?

14. How do operations under the various types of permits vary by type of trucking operations and from one region of the country to another?

15. Should there be a Federal role in the permitting of overweight vehicles carrying divisible loads? What role? Why?

National Objectives

16. *Highway Safety:* Is there a Federal role in utilizing TS&W provisions to improve highway safety? What are appropriate vehicle performance standards for improving highway safety? What equipment specifications are needed for which vehicle combinations? What driver requirements (minimum age, training, or experience) are needed? Under what highway, traffic, and weather conditions should the operation of larger or heavier vehicles be restricted? Is a regional role or State role appropriate?

17. *Productivity Enhancement and International Trade:* What potential changes in Federal TS&W provisions could be used to facilitate interstate commerce? International trade? What types of vehicles are used in North American trade? What are the significant international freight movements in terms of commodity and origins and destination? How can the movement of International Standards Organization containers be facilitated? Are there changes in TS&W standards that would better facilitate North American trade and what are the expected benefits and costs?

18. *Intermodalism:* What Federal TS&W provisions could be used to facilitate the intermodal movement of freight where this is efficient? How do TS&W limits relate to the needs of other modes, especially rail and maritime?

19. *Environment:* Which potential changes in Federal TS&W provisions are consistent or inconsistent with local and State air quality improvement strategies? What effect would increased or decreased TS&W limits have on traffic noise and vibration?

20. *Energy Conservation:* Which potential changes to Federal TS&W provisions could be used to help conserve energy?

Carrier/Shipper Standards Setting

21. If you could, how would you change truck size and weight limits and related requirements or set performance standards to optimize your trucking or logistics operations? What are the bases for the limits and requirements or performance standards? How would the changes affect highway pavements and bridges and the national objectives mentioned above? In your response, please: (1) Describe your operations including commodities carried, equipment used, area of operation, amount of traffic, lengths of haul, and arrangements with your shippers and other carriers; and (2) evaluate the benefits that you and the public will realize from your proposed changes.

Special TS&W Provisions

22. Should there be separate TS&W provisions for special commodities or equipment such as hazardous materials, agricultural and forest products, other natural resources, intermodal containers and trailers, water and oil well drilling rigs, military vehicles, and automobile and boat transporters? Why? What benefits would be realized from the special provisions?

Exemptions from TS&W Standards

23. Should any vehicles that use federally-supported highways be exempt from Federal TS&W regulation (for example, military vehicles)? Why? What benefits would be realized from the exemptions?

Authority: 23 U.S.C. 315; 49 U.S.C. 301, 302, 305; Pub. L. 102–548, 106 Stat. 3646.

Issued On: January 26, 1995.

Rodney E. Slater,

Federal Highway Administrator.

[FR Doc. 95–2533 Filed 02–01–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–22–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Public Information Collection Requirements Submitted to OMB for Review

January 23, 1995.

The Department of Treasury has submitted the following public information collection requirement(s) to OMB for review and clearance under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980, Public Law 96–511. Copies of the submission(s) may be obtained by calling the Treasury Bureau Clearance Officer listed. Comments regarding this information collection should be addressed to the OMB reviewer listed and to the Treasury Department Clearance Officer, Department of the Treasury, Room 2110, 1425 New York Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20220.

Bureau of the Public Debt (BPD)

OMB Number: 1535–0062.

Form Number: PD F 2966.

Type of Review: Extension.

Title: Special Bond of Indemnity to the United States of America.

Description: This form is used by the purchaser of savings bonds in a chain letter scheme to request refund of the purchase price of the bonds.